REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of the above-identified application is requested in view of the following remarks.

Claims 1-5 and 7-17 are presently at issue, with Claims 1, 14 and 15 being independent.

Claims 1-5 and 7-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,129,639, hereinafter *DeHority*, in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,241,349, hereinafter *Nagasaka*, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,925,325, hereinafter *Niikawa*.

The present application is directed to preventing processing of a print job that has prohibited print parameters, that is to be processed in a first (prohibited) operating environment, and that is to be processed by a printer that is in an on-line mode. Practically speaking, the application is concerned with a situation where a printer receives a print job having a parameter that is prohibited (*e.g.*, incorrect paper size) during a time period when a user is likely not present to address the incorrect paper size (*e.g.*, 8:00PM to 7:00AM). That is, the incorrect paper size could be considered a prohibited print parameter and the time period could be considered to be the first operating environment.

Along those lines, Claim 1 is amended to better define that when a print job has a prohibited print parameter that <u>processing of that print job is prohibited on condition that the operating environment determining means detects that the environment is the first operational environment and the print job is issued when the printer is operating in an on-line mode</u>.

Specifically, Claim 1 presently defines in part:

Attorney's Docket No. 1018656-000186
Application No. 09/679,070
Page 9

a controller that,

    a) when the parameter determiner determines that a print job has a printing parameter that is prohibited,

        i) prohibits processing of the print job having the prohibited print parameter

        i) on condition that the operating environment determining means detects that

            1) the environment is the first operating environment and

            2) the print job is issued when the printer is operating in an on-line mode.

A number of documents are cited in combination to disclose the features of Claim 1, however, as discussed in detail below, none of those cited documents disclose each and every claimed feature. For example, none of the documents disclose prohibiting processing of a print job based on a first operating environment that is a time frame or the printer being in an on-line mode. Further, it would not have been obvious, given the context of the cited documents, to combine them in such a way to disclose that subject matter.

Specifically, *DeHority* discloses a printer system which compares print job requirements to printer capability, *e.g.*, size, color, weight and type of paper. When a mismatch between the print job requirement and the printer capability occurs, the system determines the best alternate match by determining a mismatch magnitude. In column 3, lines 40-45, *DeHority* describes two modes of operation. The first mode automatically selects an alternative when a mismatch occurs and the second adds a step of the user checking if the determined alternative is acceptable. The user either

selects a suggested alternative or an alternate selection and print processing

proceeds. However, if the user does not make a selection the printing process

moves to "NO GO" status and the print job is prevented from being processed. It is

important to understand that the "NO GO" is not based on a time period in which the

print job is received or whether the printer is in an on-line mode. Rather, the "NO

GO" is merely based on the user's failure to select an alternative, irrespective of

when the print job is received.

The Official Action recognizes that *DeHority* does not prevent printing based

on the reception of a print job within a certain time period. For a disclosure of that

subject matter, the Official Action relies upon *Nagasaka*.

Nagasaka discloses an image forming apparatus (fax machine) that has three

control modes, none of which prohibit processing of a print job. The first control

mode is for printing and the temperature of the fixed roll 19 is for image forming. The

second control mode is called LOW sleep mode and the temperature of the fixed roll

19 is a little bit lower than the first control mode. The third control mode is called

OFF sleep mode, and no power is delivered to the fixed roll 19 so it has a very low

temperature. The purpose of the three control modes is to save power during times

of low use. That is, during the day (8:00 AM to 6:00 PM) the fax is either in the first

control mode or the second control mode and power is delivered to the fixed roll 19.

However, at other times (6:00 PM to 8:00 AM), no power is delivered to the fixed roll

19. If a print job is received during the first control mode, printing immediately

begins. If a print job is received during the second control mode, sleep control is

released and temperature of the fixed roll is increased, and once the fixed roll 19

reaches a fixing temperature, printing begins. When a print job is received during

the third mode (OFF sleep mode), sleep mode is released, the fixed roll 19 is heated, and once a proper temperature of the fixed roll 19 is achieved, printing begins. These processes are described with more technical detail in the previous response.

Niikawa is relied upon in the Official Action for a teaching that it is well known in the art to provide an on-line mode where the printer communicates with a host and an off-line mode where the printer does not communicate with the host. *Niikawa* does not disclose that the printing is prohibited based on a printer being on-line/off-line.

DeHority, *Nagasaka*, and *Niikawa* together do not disclose each and every feature defined by Claim 1 at least because none disclose a controller that <u>prohibits</u> processing of a print job that has a prohibited print parameter <u>on condition that</u> the operating environment is a first operating environment that is a time period.

Also, it would not have been obvious to modify/combine the three references to arrive at the subject matter defines in Claim 1 at least because *DeHority's* intended purpose is to <u>continue printing</u> when a mismatch occurs. In column 2, lines 5-8 *DeHority* states that "[i]t is a further object of the present invention to provide a printing system that will not reject print jobs for mismatches." That is, *DeHority* concerns a situation where a prohibited print parameter is detected (*e.g.*, incorrect paper size). A first mode entails automatic selection of an alternative when a mismatch occurs. A second mode additionally includes the user checking if the determined alternative is acceptable to the user. Print job processing is prevented only when a user fails to select an alternative. To arbitrarily modify *DeHority* to move to "NO GO" and prevent printing when a mismatch parameter is detected during a

VA 865711.1

certain time period would be directly contrary to the intended purpose of *DeHority*, *i.e.*, continuous printing, and would not have been obvious.

Should the rejection of Claim 1 be maintained, it is requested that it be specifically explained where or how the cited documents disclose prohibiting processing of a print job as defined in Claim 1, or that it be specifically explained how a skilled person would have been directed to make the necessary modifications to arrive at the claimed subject matter, *i.e.*, to modify *DeHority* to prevent printing based on a mismatch and reception within a certain time period.

Claims 14 and 15 are allowable for similar reasons as those discussed above with regard to similar language in Claim 1.

Claims 2, 7-12, 16 and 17 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependence from allowable independent claims, and also because they define features that additionally define over the cited documents.

Claims 3-5 are rejected as being unpatentable over *DeHority* in view of *Nagasaka* and further in view of *Tang*. *Tang* does not remedy the deficiencies of the rejection of Claim 1, from which Claims 3-5 depend. Therefore, Claims 3-5 are allowable for at least the same reasons.

Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *DeHority* in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,467,434, hereinafter *Hower*. *Hower* does not remedy the deficiencies of the rejection of Claim 1, from which Claim 13 depends. Therefore, Claim 13 is allowable for at least the same reasons.

For the reasons stated above, it is requested that all the rejections be withdrawn and that this application be allowed in a timely manner.

In the event that there are any questions concerning this response, or the

application in general, the Examiner is respectfully urged to telephone the

undersigned attorney so that prosecution of the application may be expedited.

                                    Respectfully submitted,

                                    BUCHANAN INGERSOLL PC
                                    (including attorneys from BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS)

Date: May 17, 2006   By: _Kevin Brayton McGoff_
                                    Kevin Brayton McGoff
                                    Registration No. 53,297

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-6620

VA 865711.1